December 19, 2013

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel for City of Saginaw
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2013-22139

Dear Ms. Russell:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 509342 (RID No. 7992).

The Saginaw Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for two specified incident reports involving the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have only submitted information related to one of the specified incident reports. We assume, to the extent any information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the department received the request, the department has released it. If the department has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the

Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. Generally, only highly intimate information implicating the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. In this instance, the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of the submitted information. Therefore, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the incidents from the requestor would not preserve the subject individual's common-law right of privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, the department must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.[1]

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/ orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Megan G. Holloway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MGH/dls

Ref: ID#509342

Enc.   Submitted documents

c: Requestor
        (w/o enclosures)

---

[1] As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.